

The Sun

SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1905.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	50 00
DAILY, Per Year	5 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	6 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	50 00

Readers who have not received their copy of the paper may have it sent by mail to them at the foregoing prices. The address may be changed as is desired. Order through your newsdealer or of The Sun, 170 Nassau street.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Things Are Different in Glasgow.

Superintendent JAMES DALRYMPLE of the municipal tramway system of Glasgow arrived in this country yesterday to inspect Mayor EDWARD F. DUNNE of Chicago in the mysteries of city managed transportation lines. Mr. DALRYMPLE, speaking of his mission said:

"The situation in Glasgow is different from what it is here."

One of the points of difference between the Glasgow situation and the Chicago situation is that the Glasgow tramways run through highways that are open to the use of all the public, while in Chicago the streets are possessed and managed in the interests of an organization known as the Teamsters' Union. The difference is great and serious.

Mr. DALRYMPLE, competent though he may be to manage Glasgow's transportation lines, may be utterly unable to advise Mayor DUNNE how to proceed to manage lines that must be operated in streets not within the control of the city.

A Significant Controversy.

The sensitiveness of the religious conscience manifested by the widespread revolt against the acceptance of money given for religious purposes when the money was improperly obtained, according to the moral sense of the receiver, is one among many indications of the groundlessness of the assumption so generally made that at this time the moral sense of the community is declining because of lessened faith in religious dogmas. The raising of the question into the prominence which it now has in the discussions of religious people, and of unbelieving people, also, is really something new in the history of moral agitation.

It is remarkable, too, that the symptoms of revolt should appear most strikingly among the Baptists. That denomination of Christians is made up almost wholly of poor people or people in very moderate material circumstances. Like the religious denominations generally, they are persistent beggars for money to carry on their religious undertakings, and to these Mr. ROCKEFELLER has been and still is the most munificent giver. The richest man in the world, he is also a Baptist peculiarly strong in his personal adherence to the tenets of that faith. Upon his liberality in giving has depended very largely the most important of the Baptist enterprises, and the expectation of still greater subsidies of money from him, the richest Baptist, is strong and probably justified.

The multiplying evidences of an indisposition of Baptists to take from him any of the much sought money needed for their religious propagation, except he gives it as a "penitent" and as restitution of gains accumulated in defiance of the Christian law, appear to be demonstrative of a spirit of remarkable self-denial in behalf of religious principle.

How does Mr. ROCKEFELLER himself feel about the matter? Is he manifesting any fear that he has imperiled his future state; that his money, the greatest accumulation in the world, and perhaps the greatest ever made in the history of individual money getting, will prevent his getting through the needle's eye? No evidence of any change in his methods of gathering in money has yet appeared. Wall Street continues to attribute to the "Standard Oil combination" great activity in the stock market. He seems to be no more content with the magnitude of his accumulations than he was when they were not a tenth as great as they are now, though even then he was among the richest men in the world. He has the reputation of looking as carefully after every penny as he does after the investment of the consolidated millions of his yearly income.

Evidently Mr. ROCKEFELLER is not afraid of eternal consequences, but regards himself as much entitled to salvation as the poorest man, as was LAZARUS, for example. He is not afraid of the fate of DIVES because he follows modern methods of money getting, though the accumulations of DIVES were probably trifling in quantity as compared with his. The latest report of his movements, that he was playing golf at his country place with great gusto, would seem to imply that his conscience is at rest. It does not suggest that as the richest of men he feels himself a sinner above all others, who must make restitution of his money as unholy gains in order to secure peace for his soul and to justify him in entertaining any hopes of salvation in a future state; yet very widely in the religious world there prevails the conviction of the Baptist minister who admonished him, that "your duty to humanity demands that you meet the charges or declare your sin."

The discussion of the whole question, now so active and so general, will do good, however, for it touches the very foundation of the Christian theory of morals. It also suggests an awakening of the religious conscience concerning the obligations of a trust which is desirable and hopeful. Finally, it proves that even in a time of diminishing faith in old time standards of religious authority regard for the moral principles of which Christianity should be the ex-

pression is even stronger and more delicate than it used to be.

It is, therefore, a very significant controversy which is now agitating the religious world.

Governor Douglas Has Enough.

His Excellency, Governor WILLIAM L. DOUGLAS of Massachusetts, will not be a candidate for reelection. When, last year, he accepted the Democratic nomination he did not expect to be elected. His splendid campaign, conducted on issues appealing particularly to the Massachusetts electorate, overturned the normal Republican majority in the State and set the politicians a-blinking. ROOSEVELT and DOUGLAS carried the Old Bay State. The Hon. JOHN L. BATES can't explain it yet.

As soon as the result of the election became known, Mr. DOUGLAS found that his relations with the Democratic State machine were going to be troublesome, to say the least. The machine men regarded the victory as theirs. They expected Governor DOUGLAS to administer his office for their benefit. By some obscure mental process they figured out an explanation of his success that gave all the credit to themselves. Having taken the credit, they were ready to take the office. Generously enough, they were willing to let Governor DOUGLAS take all responsibility.

But Governor DOUGLAS had other views. He regarded his election as a victory for the people. Stubbornly he refused to regard himself as the agent of the machine, and insisted on standing out for the Commonwealth. The machine charged him with ingratitude. The voters, many of them forgetting partisanship, applauded him. The machine withdrew its support. To sustain his veto of the Soldiers' Gratuity bill the Governor had to look to Republican votes. His Commissioner of Police pleaded the Republicans better than it did the Democrats. In fact, Governor DOUGLAS has been a sort of a non-partisan Governor.

What the result of this year's election might be were he to run again for the office he now fills is a problem. Lieutenant-Governor CURTIS GUILD, Jr., will be the Republican nominee. He is popular with both parties. Maybe Mr. DOUGLAS would be defeated, any way. It is improbable that any Democrat can be elected. There is no reason to believe that ex-Representative JOHN R. TRAYLOR of Worcester, who owed his election to Congress to Republican factional bickerings in the district, and who is now talked of as Mr. DOUGLAS's successor on the Democratic State ticket, will draw enough Republican votes to upset the normal division of the parties, but he is as likely a candidate as the party has.

If Governor DOUGLAS has not pleased the Boston machine leaders, he has pleased a majority of the citizens of the State. This is the reward he coveted when he took office, and he can now spare the machine much better than it can spare him.

Who Will Own the North Pole?

The knowledge that a new and resolute attempt is to be made by an American explorer to reach a point further north than any hitherto attained is, doubtless, accountable for a statement made the other day in the Ottawa House of Commons by the Premier of the Dominion in the course of a debate on the organization of the coast of North Lands. Sir WILFRID LAURENCE had observed, he said, on recent maps that American explorers had been given to certain territories in the north which, in his judgment, are under British jurisdiction. The jurisdiction, he added, would be asserted, and Americans would not be permitted to "take a position in those lands." In other words, Sir WILFRID does not recognize the existence of a right by discovery. Are we to conclude that if the new American expedition which is to pursue its voyage northward through Baffin Bay and Smith Strait should achieve its coveted object, the North Pole itself would be claimed as Ottawa as British property, and the Stars and Stripes would not be suffered to wave there without protest?

Admitting, for the sake of argument, that a tract of land exists at and around the North Pole, we can see that the question of its ultimate ownership is complicated by the further inquiry whether such land is an island encircled by the Polar Sea or is connected by an isthmus with land previously known and claimed. We may take for granted that in the former event the validity of the discoverer's title to ownership would not be disputed. Even if the doctrine of "spheres of influence," which avowedly was formulated by the great Powers in conference with reference to Africa alone, should be deemed applicable by analogy to the North American Continent, it would not apply to territory separated from it by an ocean.

Let us suppose, then, that the region surrounding the geographical Pole should prove to be linked with Franz Josef Land, to which Austria has acquired a claim by discovery; or with Spitzbergen, which is claimed by Sweden, though it was known to the Russians long before its discovery by BARENTS; with Greenland, which belongs to Denmark; or with British North America, which as we have seen claims Grinnell Land and all the more northerly points yet discovered on the coast bordering on the west the straits which have Greenland for their eastern boundary. Under such circumstances, would there be even any technical ground for the assumption that the North Pole would belong, not to the discoverer, or rather to the Power of which he is a citizen or subject, but to the Power with which the circum-polar region happened to prove connected? It seems clear that in the absence of any international agreement regarding spheres of influence within the Arctic zone, and in the absence of any express treaty stipulations, the question would be answered in pursuance of the doctrine propounded and acted upon in the sixteenth century and later by England, France, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Russia, the doctrine that discovery gives a valid title, though such title may be lost by non-user and needs to be confirmed

by occupation. That any treaty exists between England on the one hand and France, England, Russia or Denmark on the other, by which British North America is admitted to extend northward as far as the Pole, we do not believe; for treaty framers would hardly choose for a terminus a geographical point which, conceivably, may be connected by land, not only with British North America, but also with Greenland, and perhaps also with territory to which Russia or Sweden might lay claim.

Even if there were any technical ground for the claim that the North Pole will belong to Great Britain if the circum-polar tract shall prove to be linked by land with British North America, it would be mischievous and odious, from a scientific and moral point of view, to assert such a claim in advance, and thus discourage the aspirations and efforts of explorers. It is in the interest of international science that the attempt to ascertain the precise location of the North Pole is made, and it is the duty of enlightened countries to promote and not impede such high aiming endeavors. If ever, too, a moral right to ownership ought to be conceded to the exhibition of fortitude, daring and self-sacrifice, such a right must be held to vest in those who, in the cause of science, have confronted the hardships, the privations and the dangers of polar exploration. Dearly bought, at cheapest, will be the honor of discovering the North Pole; and he who accomplishes the feat should not be robbed of the privilege of planting there the flag of his own country.

Meanwhile, it is quite possible that the North Pole will prove to be surrounded by water. In that case, of course, there will be no land for anybody to claim.

Bail in Cases of Arrest for Minor Offenses.

The case of Vice-President DAYTON of the First National Bank directs attention to an outrageous custom which, of all abuses of similar nature from which our citizens suffer, is perhaps the most exasperating, namely, that of imprisoning an individual arrested in this town for a trivial offense until a determination of his case can be made by a police magistrate.

In no other country in the world, we believe, not even where respect for the rights of the individual is not over-garbed, do such practices obtain as in the city of New York. In such countries, as in England, the intervention of the police in small matters is made by means of a summons to appear before a minor court, and it is found that this practice is just as effectual in enforcing the law as an actual arrest by a police officer. Under the practice with us any citizen, even the most reputable and distinguished, can be held to a police station for some petty infraction of the municipal ordinances, placed in a filthy police cell with beggars, criminals and outcasts, and so detained there until he is taken to a police court, unless he satisfactorily arranges the question of bail. If he happens to be arrested in the late afternoon or evening his plight may be imagined, as there will be no session of a police court until the next morning.

Our police authorities here have uniformly declared that the custom of "summoning" prevailing in other lands to which allusion has been made could never be adapted to this city. Admitting that this assertion is correct, and that arrests are necessary in case of violations of the law of the kind described, it will be seen that the most shameful part of the nuisance in question hinges upon the discretion the police sergeants have so long enjoyed in the matter of taking bail. For a long time it was the custom of those sergeants, with absolutely no legal right whatever, to insist upon real estate bail in all cases in which they were authorized to take bail at all, this custom, of course, playing directly into the hands of the professional bondsmen, whose villainy has so often been exposed. The police are now directed to accept cash bail or any other reasonable security; yet they seem to endeavor to evade the directions of their superior officers as much as they can, and to maintain the old source of revenue to the professional bondsmen. It is a matter of daily occurrence for the police sergeants in this city to refuse any other than real estate bail in cases of poor, ignorant people who are brought before them, and all "orders" from headquarters will not apparently stop the abuse.

The truth is that, if it is found to be necessary in our city to arrest people instead of serving them with a summons in these cases, there should be in session throughout a good portion of the night, as well as the day, a certain number of police courts. It would not be necessary to have all the police courts open, but such a number of them that anybody who was arrested at any time could be brought within a relatively short period before a proper judicial tribunal. Until provision of this sort is made we shall have an endless continuation of such incidents as the case of Mr. DAYTON and of ignominies equally distressing perpetrated upon other citizens.

The Benevolent Bostonians.

The New York city treasury is occasionally enriched to the extent of \$25 or \$50 from some contributor whose remittance comes under the head of "conscience," but outside of the Sailors' Snug Harbor fund, established many years ago by Capt. RANDALL for indigent seamen, this metropolis has few available "funds." Boston is more fortunate. It has more than \$1,000,000 of capital invested in "funds" held in trust by the municipality for public spirited residents of Boston. The chief of these is the Benjamin Franklin fund, left by the patriotic sage to "the inhabitants of the town of Boston in Massachusetts" for loans, at 5 per cent. interest, to such young married artificers under the age of twenty-five as have faithfully fulfilled the duties required in their indentures, and whose good moral character is vouched for by two respectable citizens. On Feb. 1, 1901, a remote date, the fund will be divided "equally between the

city of Boston and the State of Massachusetts."

ARCHIBALD BABCOCK left \$3,000, the interest on which is to be used in "procuring the services of musicians to play on or near the small common or neck at the corner of Main and Cambridge streets." JONAS BALL left \$1,000 "for the purchase of clothing for indigent persons leaving hospitals." MARTHA HOWARD THURSTON CARTER gave \$2,000 for the purchase of books. DAVID W. CHREYER bequeathed \$3,000 for the purchase of pocket cases for surgeons; SILAS DUKES, \$15,000 for hospital supplies; DANIEL SHAPER FORD, \$6,000 for a similar purpose, and ELISHA GOODNOW, \$26,000.

MARY PERKINS left \$7,500 for artificial limbs and surgical appliances for the needy of Boston; MARIE LOUISE SHAW, \$2,000 for the purchase of flowers and fruit; ANNA WHITE VORSE, \$100,000 for hospital purposes; JACOB VORSE, \$2,000 for "ringing the bells, firing salutes, music and decorating the streets" on the anniversary of the battle of Bunker Hill; he also left \$2,000 for the purchase of flags; GEORGE H. HYDE, \$14,000 for a statue to RUFUS CHOATE; JOHN FOSTER, \$30,000 for a monument to the Rev. WILLIAM E. CHANNING; ELLEN C. JOHNSON, \$28,000 for a drinking fountain. JOHN BOTSWORTH left \$30,000 for the relief of Bostonians of good character "reduced by the act of Providence, not by indolence, extravagance or other vice." He also left \$150,000 for the "nurture and instruction of poor orphan children under the age of fourteen." LUCY BULLMAN left \$28,000 for the poor, and ELISHA GOODNOW, in addition to his other bequest, \$8,500 to the poor "without reference to religious faith or belief."

JAMES HOLTON left \$5,000 "for furnishing good and plentiful meals to the Protestant paupers of Boston" on holidays; MORRIS HUNT, \$11,000 for the relief and welfare of "Protestant destitute residents of Boston"; DAVID JEFFRIES, \$8,500 for "the purchase of tea and coffee, chocolate and sugar for the refreshment of those persons who, in the providence of God, seek refuge in the Boston almshouse."

JONATHAN MASON left a fund of \$9,000 for the poor of Boston, and BENJAMIN PEMBERTON, \$147,000 for the same purpose. CALES PIERCE left \$1,500 for "fuel for indigent widows"; DAVID SEARS, \$345,000 for the poor; RACHEL T. STEVENS, \$5,000 for the support of "poor worthy Protestant single women of Boston who have arrived at the age of fifty"; WILLIAM STOUTON, \$3,800 for the poor of Boston, and NATHANIEL FREDERICK THAYER, \$75,000 for the use of "Protestant widows and single women without distinction of color, preference to be given to those who have seen better days."

These funds, the income only of which is applied to the purposes named by the early Boston benefactors, are administered by the city of Boston. No other city of the country has an assortment of "funds" comparable either in variety of intent or in amount and practical advantage to the beneficiaries.

Look Here, Upon This Picture, and Be on This.

From those ever brilliant Chicago galleries we pick out two canvases:

No. 1. Mrs. So and So, "author and social leader" in Lake Forest, is about to return to nature and dispense the sincere milk of the unsophisticated cow. "For years I have given much of my time to literary work," she says; "and I find I need a change." She gives up books for a time; drops the pen and takes up the sterilized milkpail. We speak under correction, bucolics having altered much since our youth. Perhaps milkpails have gone the way of milkmaids, whom one seldom sees save on the comic opera stage and accoutred in diamonds, whom a seldom sees save on the comic opera stage and accoutred in diamonds. Probably cows are self-milking in these improved scientific days. Be that as it may, the distinguished and highly sensitive lady in question is going to open the Crab Tree Dairy and sell better than the best milk and cream to the best restaurants. Red tiled roofs, white tiled rooms, every scientific appliance and apparatus; and only the choicest product of the best bred cows will be graduated from this school.

Naturally the decorative possibilities of such an institution are recognized by men of taste:

"A number of the restaurants which cater to an exclusive trade have notified the author that they will only buy cream and milk from her, but they wish to have the output of the dairy bottled in attractive and elegant jugs. One firm announces a fancy silver milk and cream jug in imitation of the silver plate at Crab Tree House, and another chain of restaurants send her fancy copper jugs of ornamental design should be used."

Doubtless Marie Antoinette dairies, Pastor Fido dairies and so on will be set up; and they can't help prospering. We implore the race of overworked women to get off the high horse and sit by the side of the beautiful cow-eyed cow. From passion to milk; from blood and tears to milk; from Art (pretty thoroughly sterilized) to Nature with a red roof and white tiles.

No. 2. MRS. HORAC, president of the Chicago Dressmakers' Club, has been telling it in the fall:

"There is a great demand for the hoop in Chicago, and they cannot be made fast enough to supply those who want them. And no wonder. Just see how beautifully they set on the figure and how easy it is to walk in them." She pointed to MRS. SCHUBERT, who marched back and forth amid faint feminine notes of applause. Then the speaker continued:

"Women who have not worn them say 'I will never put one of those horrid old things on,' but when they have once tried them they are in ecstasy over them and bring all their friends in to get hoop too. The hoop does away with the necessity of wearing a large number of skirts to get the flare effect so much desired, and it is found to be both graceful and comfortable."

"Women think there is trouble about walking in them, but see how easily MRS. SCHUBERT walks. When women declare that it is difficult to board a street car or get into a carriage with hoops, but watch MRS. SCHUBERT."

"The corresponding secretary here sprang lightly upon a chair, as an imaginary carriage step, and flitted back again to the floor, with a dexterity which brought more applause."

"And still other women think that something

dreadful will happen if they sit down suddenly with the hoop," continued MRS. HORAC. "But look at MRS. SCHUBERT and be convinced there is nothing to the idea."

"MRS. SCHUBERT sat down suddenly."

It is for the trousered world to sit down and shut up while MRS. HORAC sounds to it the terrible approach and triumphant reentrance of the hoop. It is for philosophers to wait, patiently. The "waterfall" and the Grecian bend have their appointed hour of palingenesis.

"I would not advise extremely stout women to wear them," whispers MRS. HORAC gently. Extremely stout women need not be advised. The extender the fashion, the surer they are to adopt it.

A well known engineer has suggested that the capacity of a congested street can be doubled by excluding horse drawn teams from it, permitting motor cars to drive through. The horse drawn space as much space as the vehicle he drives, and it is to be made to drive through the street available for vehicles.—Baltimore Sun.

Mr. McADOO has done better than that. He has shown that the capacity of a congested street can be doubled by the simple expedient of putting more horses into it—horses with men on top of them and cool heads on top of the man.

RATE MAKING IN POLITICS.

From a letter of James Schouler in the Springfield Republican.

At the bottom of all this agitation, as it appears to me, is a general discontent with present economic conditions, and that arraying of the poor against the rich which, if misdirected, leads to mischief. If rate making by the Government is so good a thing for the rich, why is it not demanded for it is not likely to cease with such an application of the principle. Already we see laboring men in a chief city seeking to control by mob violence the business of their employers, or, indeed, all business, reckless of stability of property or the encouragement of enterprise. Your particular property is a profitable newspaper. Would you be willing to have it controlled by politicians and non-experts determine at what price you should sell your sheet or furnish your advertising space? And would you consider yourselves indemnified if, after an appeal to the courts and a costly litigation, you were reinstated in the rates you desired, having meanwhile lowered your prices to a host of patrons against whom no practical recourse remained?

We whose modest investments, for ourselves and those who trust us, are largely of necessity in railroads, banks or industrial corporations are not callous to the wrongs done by those who direct their operations. We shall welcome all wholesome supervision, all correction of abuses, all limitation in such management of their selfish inside operations. But to wrest business from the hands of its owners and make of Government a meddling monopolizer is quite another thing.

Roman Catholics and Evolution.

To the Editors of The Sun.—Sir: Your correspondent "X. Y. Z." questions my statement that there are 250,000 Catholics in the world and asks for the source of such figures. The latest figures given by the Bureau de la Statistique, places the number at 250,000,000. German lay authorities give approximately the same figure.

That there are 5,000 converts a year to Catholicism in the diocese of New York was stated in a public address by Archbishop Parley, whose reputation for carefulness and veracity has never been impaired.

Even if there were only 500,000 Catholics, my comparison of the total with 9,000 newspaper letters is not an exaggeration of the phenomenon as a sign of the times would retain its force and not be "misleading."

Undoubtedly there are secessions from the Catholic Church, but that they are more than counterbalanced, in the United States at least, by accessions, is shown by the rapid growth of the Church here. The Paulist Fathers estimate that there are more than 100,000 converts to Catholicism a year in this country, and assert that they are mainly drawn from the most intelligent classes. The fact that on the whole the Catholic population of the United States is in a state of flux detracts not at all from the impressiveness or force of the solid, unmoved body as a whole.

"X. Y. Z." is mistaken if he thinks Catholics are unmoved by "higher criticism" and the "watch-word of evolution" because they are "laggards on the spiritual path." Catholics are not laggards, nor are they unmoved by such questions, for two reasons. First, they take the ground that an assertion without proof does not establish a fact, whether the assertion is made by a scientist, a philosopher or a spiritualist. Their reason does not allow them to accept a theory or a hypothesis until its truth is demonstrated beyond question. Secondly, in matters of faith and morals spiritual affairs, their Church has a tribunal which Catholics believe was established by Christ to pass final judgment with respect to the truth of any doctrine or theory. Consequently, Catholics do not beat the air about the settlement of spiritual matters, any more than sensible American citizens do over decisions of the United States Supreme Court in civil affairs.

As to the question of the evolution of Catholics, they are just as free to believe what they choose as are any other reasoning beings, so long as they do not claim to be guided by the theory of the evolution of evolutionists who insist on a purely material basis of the universe. They are advised that they will waste time in bothering over the question until they are able to prove the truth of their theory. Their reason does not allow them to accept a theory or a hypothesis until its truth is demonstrated beyond question. Secondly, in matters of faith and morals spiritual affairs, their Church has a tribunal which Catholics believe was established by Christ to pass final judgment with respect to the truth of any doctrine or theory. Consequently, Catholics do not beat the air about the settlement of spiritual matters, any more than sensible American citizens do over decisions of the United States Supreme Court in civil affairs.

Summer Music in New York and Chicago.

To the Editors of The Sun.—Sir: Your editorial article regarding music in summer ought to be interesting reading for all New Yorkers. My dear sir, if the people of this great city were as musical as the people of the South, they would be a different kind of people. There would be no occasion for wondering whether or not Mr. Walter Damrosch and his players will receive enough loyal support to prevent failure, as in years past.

The fact that Mr. Damrosch is going elsewhere for the summer is conclusive that he is a good judge of these matters and is not willing to take any chance of failure. He is not only doing this, but adding insult to injury by planting his orchestra in the windy winds of Chicago—the last place on earth for a New Yorker to look for refinement and culture and an appreciation of the fine arts. Fact is, we are provincial. Chicago will not only appreciate Mr. Damrosch, but will also show loyal support to five or six other orchestras, nearly as good.

Poor old Chicago, the gutter-snipe of cities, the town of bunco and sham and bow; that's the place where the worst and poorest old Chicago is to be found. H. D. SAWYER.

To the Schools and Pupils of America.

Schools of my native land, students who faithful stand.

In class hand to hand, or lined by ye—

For Fair Futurity—

Hold fast such power to raise man's heart to joyful rapture.

Learning you show to be all might, all mastery; Free, he who runs may read, hindered by no dead.

Color no race; no price money or task device Is asked of those who thirst, to drink of knowledge free.

O Land, your work, how grand! O Mater! of you demand

Help by the helpless ones born under other hands; Help by the slow, lead the slow moving with a hand. O Land, the word Old World, resting with banners furled.

Let motions greater, men, should all the past undo; Egots to hold and chain in man's paid labor's train; Tollers who, staggering, gaze westward toward juster ways.

Be they great for people and for State, Learning, with love and truth, ruling in age and youth.

Crowned as the greatest thing, Freedom's Fraternity.

FLORENCE JACKSON. CHATEAU DES FLORES, CHATEAU, FRANCE, May, 1905.

THE LATE BARON ALPHONSE DE ROTHSCHILD.

History of the Famous Family of Jewish Bankers and Philanthropists.

To the Editors of The Sun.—Sir: The German historian Theodor Mommsen expressed in one of his writings the opinion that the history of the house of Rothschild is, from the viewpoint of the history of the world, more important than that of more than one of the smaller reigning dynasties of the German Fatherland. It must therefore be of interest to many readers to learn a few authentic facts, not only to the chief of the Paris branch of the international dynasty of financiers, who died on May 26, at his palace, at the ripe old age of 78, but also as to his ancestors and living relatives. Biographers were never welcome guests either at the bureau of the Rothschilds, and it was only with the greatest difficulties, and thanks to personal relations, that these facts as to the famous family of financiers were obtained.

Baron Alphonse de Rothschild was born in Paris, Feb. 1, 1827. He was employed at an early age by his father, Baron James Mayer de Rothschild, in the management of the Chemin de Fer du Nord. In 1854 he became head of the French house, and in the same year was made one of the governors of the Bank of France. In 1869 he became president of the Central Consistory of the Israelites of France, to which he had belonged as early as 1851 as delegate of the Jewish community of Bordeaux. When the Franco-Prussian war ended disastrously for the French Republic, Baron Alphonse de Rothschild was made the payment of the indemnity of five milliards of francs by France to Germany. It was especially through his ability that France was enabled to pay the indemnity within a very short time.

He was a great lover of art and possessed one of the largest art collections of Europe. He has presented over 600 pictures to the various museums of Paris. In 1870 he was elected to the Académie des Beaux-Arts. The Chateau de Ferrières-en-Brie (Department of Seine et Marne) was his property. The German staff was installed in the chateau during the siege of Paris. There, also, Jules Favre, on behalf of the French Government, conducted the unsuccessful peace negotiations with Prince Bismarck. The philanthropic interests of Baron Alphonse de Rothschild were numerous and extensive. Special mention deserves to be made of the 10,000,000 francs fund given in 1904 by him and his two brothers, Gustave and Edmond, to be employed in the construction of a new dwelling house, and for the general furtherance of the working classes. About fifteen years ago the Baron, who was a passionate hunter, was shot by accident by one of his own guards. In the right eye, which he subsequently lost, it was a pathetic sight to see the tall old gentleman promenading the streets of Paris with his black bandage over his right eye. The philanthropic interests of Baron Lionel Rothschild of London, who survives him. His only son and successor, Edmond, born Feb. 24, 1868, fought a duel during the excitement of the Dreyfus case, and was wounded. He is a young man who may be aware of the fact that the old family mansion in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, which dates as far back as 1610, at first bore the sign of a green shield with a white eagle, and later a red eagle. It should be noted that the name of the family should not be written as a sign of a sign.

The earliest notice of a member of the family, given in the burial records of Frankfurt, is that of Moses Rothschild, born in April, 1550, whose daughter, in 1608, married a member of the name family as mentioned in Worms in the seventeenth century as rabbis. One of these, Mendel Rothschild, was for several years preacher at Prague, was rabbi of Bamberg, and finally rabbi of Worms for fourteen years.

Mayer Amsehel, founder of the house (born at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, 1748, died 1812), was himself at one time destined for the rabbinate and studied for the priesthood at the Talmudical Academy of Furtth, Bavaria. His later relations with William IX, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, and the origin, therefore, connected, of his great fortune, were developed in legend either by him or by acceptance. The naked truth is as follows:

Mayer Amsehel had become acquainted with the then Crown Prince in 1773, but he does not seem to have done much business with him until toward the end of the eighteenth century. He changed some English gold for him in 1780, and in 1794 took as much as £150,000 worth, but not alone, he having associated with him some other bankers. The Crown Prince of Prussia, who was then the son of Frederick the Great, was only toward the end of 1788 that he had sufficient credit with the Prince to undertake singlehanded a large quantity of gold brokerage. From 1800 to 1812 he had to place with the Crown Prince 1,750,000 thaler, mostly at 4 per cent, and it is to be invested in Frankfurt town loans, part in Danish loans. In 1801 he became the Landgrave's court agent.

Napoleon's seizure of Holland in 1803, the leaders of the anti-Napoleonic league chose Frankfurt as a financial center wherefrom to obtain the sinews of war. After the battle of Jena in 1806 the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel fled to Denmark, where he had already deposited much of his wealth through the agency of Mayer Amsehel Rothschild, leaving in the hands of the latter specie and works of art of great value. Owing to the fact that these were hidden away in wine casks, and escaping the search of Napoleon's soldiers when they entered Frankfurt, were restored intact in the same casks in 1814 when the French returned to the city. The facts are somewhat less romantic and more businesslike. Rothschild, so far from being in danger, was on such good terms with Napoleon's nominee, Prince of Orange, that he was named in 1810 a member of the Electoral College of Darmstadt. The Electoral money had been sent to Nathan in London, who in 1808 utilized it to purchase 2,000,000 worth of gold bonds from the Emperor, knowing that it would be needed for Wellington's Peninsula campaign.

While the early history of the firm was dominated by the influence of Nathan Mayer, the son of the founder, who died in 1812, the firm was not only a success, but a success of whom and of his brothers not less than forty-five States loans, aggregating \$654,847,200, were issued from 1817 to 1851, after the year 1850 the younger brother, James, came to the front and the Paris house gained that predominance in French finance which it retained throughout the nineteenth century, for the greater part thanks to the financial genius of the late Baron Alphonse de Rothschild.

An interesting incident in the financial history of the London branch is the declaration on the part of Baron Lionel to take up the Russian loan of 1861, owing to his disapproval of the German of the Russian Government toward Poland.